

**Notice of Allowability**

Application No.

10/066,801

Examiner

EBENEZER SACKEY

Applicant(s)

PRZEWOSNY ET AL.

Art Unit

1626

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to amendment filed on 07/08/03.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are claims 1-29.
3. ☐ The drawings filed on \_\_\_\_\_ are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of the:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.
5. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
(a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
6. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

7. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
8. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS must be submitted.  
(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached  
1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
(b) ☐ including changes required by the proposed drawing correction filed \_\_\_\_\_, which has been approved by the Examiner.  
(c) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet.

9. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1 ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
3 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
5 ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449), Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
7 ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
- 2 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
4 ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No. 9/29.  
6 ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment  
8 ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance  
9 ☐ Other

### **REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: applicants claim substituted pyrrolidine-2, 3, 4-trione compound of formula (I) and methods of using said compounds in treating various disease states. Applicants have shown by way of the Formalin test the effectiveness of the compounds in treating pain. Additionally, the specification also demonstrates that the claimed compounds show an affinity for NMDA-receptor channel (receptor binding studies found at paragraphs 0030-0038). Furthermore, the Drug Data Report published by Prous Science of Barcelona, Spain submitted by applicant's supports the treatment of the various disorders with the claimed compounds.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### ***Election/Restriction***

1. This application discloses and claims a plurality of patentably distinct inventions far too numerous to list individually. Each of these inventions contains a plurality of patentably distinct diseases classified in class 514, in various subclasses. For these reasons provided below, restriction to the following diseases is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

A. Method of treating depressions

- B. Method of treating drug abuse
- C. Method of treating alcohol abuse
- D. Method of treating mental illnesses
- E. Method of treating Alzheimer's disease
- F. Method of treating AIDS dementia
- G. Method of treating anxiolysis.

In accordance with the decisions in *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984), restriction of a Markush group is proper where the compounds within the group either (1) do not share a common utility, or (2) do not share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. In addition, a Markush group may encompass a plurality of independent and distinct inventions where two or more members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the other member(s) obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

***Rationale Establishing Patentable Distinctiveness Within Each Group***

Each disease listed above involves mechanisms recognized in the art as being distinct from each other because of their pathways. Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that one disease would be obvious over the other diseases, i.e. they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not

irrebuttable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holdings of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lahu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

Each of the different methods of treating disease state set forth above is unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Methods of use are unrelated if one of three differences are found between them. These differences are 1) the population being treated, 2) the material being used, and 3) the methodology for treatment. If any one or more of these differences exist and are patentably distinct, then the methods are unrelated. In the instant case, the different methods of use inventions are unrelated because the patient population treated for each method is divergent. For example, a method of treating multiple myeloma presumes that the patients being treated have cancer, while a method of treating hepatitis presumes the patient has hepatitis.

In addition, because of the plethora of subclasses associated with the listed diseases, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set

forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different class and subclasses, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.


During a telephone conversation with applicant's attorney, J. D. Evans, on 09/29/03, an agreement was reached to restrict the diseases listed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to E. Sackey whose telephone number is (703) 305-6889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane, can be reached on (703) 308-4537. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

EOS  
September 30, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alan L. Rotman  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1625, Group 1600  
Technology Center 1